UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The World Significance of the German-Russian Pact - - - *Taraknath Das*

Religion Answers Force - *Wallace W. Robbins*

The Democratic Dilemma - *David M. Bloch*

Observations in Russia—I - *Victor S. and Rachelle S. Yarros*

Under the Black Flag - *Robert C. Schaller*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 2

Chicago, September 18, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1870."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 19

ARTICLES—
The World Significance of the German-Russian Pact—TARAKNATH DAS 22
Religion Answers Force—WALLACE W. ROBBINS 24
The Democratic Dilemma—DAVID M. BLOCH 27
Observations in Russia—I—VICTOR S. AND RACHELLE S. YARROS 29
Under the Black Flag—ROBERT C. SCHALLER 30

POETRY—
Friends of America, Stand By!—LUCIA TRENT 21
Witch Hunters—STANTON A. COBLENTZ 30

THE STUDY TABLE—
Toward Adult Education—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 31
Crime, Liquor and Sex Under Repeal—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES .. 31

CORRESPONDENCE—
Russia and Mendelism—HUGH WESTON 32
How to Make a Communist—A. MARION HOLMES 32

THE FIELD—
World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches 18

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

WORLD ALLIANCE FOR INTERNATIONAL FRIENDSHIP THROUGH THE CHURCHES

The World Alliance, representing Christian Churches in over 30 countries, meeting in Geneva, passed the following:

August 16, 1939

A Plea for a World Conference

In view of the chaotic conditions throughout the world today, the increasing breakdown of international morality, the staggering burden of mounting armaments, the dislocation of international economic life, and the threat of war and revolutions;

The World Alliance for International Friendship through the Churches reaffirms its conviction, as stated in former resolutions, that the only way out of the present impasse is for all nations to meet and confer on their essential problems and difficulties in a spirit of conciliation and coöperation. We recognize that the increase of international anarchy, conflict, and hate, makes any appeal for a new world conference seem Utopian. On the other hand, we are convinced that unless some far-reaching international agreements can be speedily reached, it is utterly fallacious to suppose that the present drift can end in anything but general war and chaos.

The International Chamber of Commerce, representing business men from 41 nations, meeting in Copenhagen in July, passed a strong resolution calling for a world conference. Their resolution cited the disastrous consequences of war and said: "No enduring peace has been accomplished. With the development of modern instruments of destruction, the possibilities of future wars are appalling. . . One of the most discouraging aspects of the world today, perhaps of this whole epoch indeed, is that it should be necessary to recall time and again these most elementary truths."

We heartily concur in the sentiments expressed by this business group and shared by the popular majority in all countries. Concretely, we propose that the governments take advantage of the precedent created by the Hague Conferences, and under the provisions voted at the Second Conference held in 1907, call the Third Hague Conference to convene at as early a date as is consistent with adequate preparation.

If such a conference is to deal effectively with the underlying moral and spiritual political and economic causes of conflict, at least one or two years of intensive preparation are necessary.

We confidently believe that if the States become actively engaged in preparing for such a conference, as the work proceeds international faith will be gradually restored and peace with justice can be established. Therefore we propose that international preparatory commissions be set up immediately to deal with such questions as colonies, economic and financial rela-

(Continued on page 32)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 1939 No. 2

AIR RAID

Children have a pretty notion
God dwells in the sky.
Just beyond the arch of blue
Heaven's portals lie.

God, a kindly Father, paces
Wondrous streets of gold,
Sending guardian angels out
To shepherd all His fold.

Watching from his vantage place
Lest any sparrow fall,
Cherishing each living thing
And children most of all.

Ah, alas! for childish notions
When the skyways hum,
When, from the ramparts of God's house,
Birds of terror come.

Now has God abandoned Heaven,
And the angels fled;
Who will comfort stricken children?
Who can mend the dead?

GERTRUDE HAHN.

"THE PEOPLE, LORD, THE PEOPLE"

As the horrible catastrophe of war engulfs the world again—for the second time in the life-experience of this generation!—we can think of but one thing, and that is the people, the common people of every land, innocent of offense, hating and fearing war, who are now being driven like sheep to the slaughter. Nowhere on all this planet, outside of certain chancellories and military headquarters, are there persons who desire war. If a plebescite were taken in England, or France, or Poland, or Italy, yes, in Germany, the vote against war in each and every country would be so wholeheartedly against war as to make a Nazi election look like a closely contested struggle. Never in all history has there been such popular unanimity against resort to arms for the settlement of disputes between nations. If not from government offices, at least from the hearts of men, war today stands outlawed. Yet here it is—the destruction, the massacre, Death loosed to reap his harvest—and the people as helpless as leaves before last year's hurricane! How all this will end, what havoc will be wrought, what irreparable losses sustained, no man can say except to prophecy the worst. But this we know—that the people will suffer beyond all measure of calculation and all reach of compassion and succor. Their cities will be wrecked, their homes destroyed, their sons slain—their world wiped out beyond all repair of generations and perhaps of centuries. Why should the people of this fair earth thus be smitten? What are these governments that issue the decree of death for millions? Germany, Italy, France, Britain—"did you ever meet them?" asks Dorothy Thompson. In the despair of this hour we can feel some comfort in the thought that few of the governments that enter this war will survive—and few statesmen who now see the beginning will see the end. But this is poor comfort as we face these myriads of common people, and behold their agony. If we do nothing else during this war, we will love and pity and try to help them. *All* of them—English, French, Germans, Italians, Poles, Turks! Not one shall be excluded from our heart. God hath made them all "of one blood," his children, and they are our brethren.

GUILT!

The doubt, which is still debated, of responsibility for the last war will not apply to *this* war. So far as immediate and direct causes are concerned, Hitler stands forth in naked and ghastly isolation. The Fuehrer has forced the issue from the start of this latest crisis, which was of his own deliberate making, and at the crucial moment launched his war machine alone in a speech of unparalleled defiance. But in the background stand other and remoter but no less dreadful causes. Next only to Hitler we place Stalin, now described by the Nazi leader as Germany's "eternal friend." A Soviet military mission started for Berlin before the German troops had begun their invasion of Polish territory, and the trip, we may be sure, was not taken for sightseeing purposes. Deeper in the background stands the Versailles Treaty and its makers, of whom there remains alive only Lloyd George who has had the amazing decency in this crisis to keep his lips tight-shut. When the Treaty was signed there were observers aplenty who declared that it contained the making of another and more terrible war, and that of all the dragon's teeth sown in the pact none was more dangerous than the Polish corridor. This does not excuse Hitler of his awful responsibility as a world-destroyer, any more than Hitler's madness excuses the Versailles peace-makers (so-called). But

the record stands! Lastly, and fundamental to the whole catastrophe, is the international system under which we live. Capitalism, imperialism, competing nationalisms, armed preparedness, power politics—these are the basic ingredients of the explosive which is wrecking civilization at this moment. We agree with Mr. H. G. Wells, in his August 29th broadcast, that this system makes our wars. To try to put idealism into these wars, to make them battles for democracy and whatnot, is ridiculous. If idealism were present in the struggle, there would be no wars. Well—the issue is now joined, as it was in 1914. And this we know—that the outcome will be decisive: either the complete destruction of civilizaton and the return to barbarism, or else, as Mr. Wells has dreamed, the slow building out of wreckage of a new and better world. The system in any case is gone.

AMERICA'S TASK

If we save anything out of this war, if civilization endures in the world at all, it will be because America sees what is at once her duty and her opportunity. This is to stay out of the European conflict at any cost, and use all of her enormous strength to preserve civilization in this continent, and to bring peace at the earliest moment to this distracted earth. If this country herself enters into this struggle, as she so mistakenly entered into the struggle of 1914-1918, it will mean the placing in instant jeopardy of all the precious treasures of democracy and culture which lie within our care, and the ending of all hope of peace until mankind lies prostrate and very close to death. On the other hand, if we resolutely stay out of the conflict, the nation will stand strong and beneficent as an instrument of succor, an agent of mercy, a haven of refuge, a witness to the light, and an undiscouraged, undismayed, and untiring maker of peace. "Blessed are the peace-makers." We may say that the European nations have failed in this crisis because, in the nature of things, they could not succeed. But this fatality does not apply to the United States. We stand as remote from the issues as from the *locale* of the fight, and exercise all the rare powers of a free agent. These powers may be used in this hour for evil or for good—i. e., for war or for peace. Which means, as we see it, for the destruction or salvation of mankind! Every influence toward keeping America out of war must be brought to bear upon the President, upon Congress, upon the press. Peace societies must be militant, aggressive, tireless. Churches must realize their momentous duty, laid down in unmistakable terms by the dictates of their religion. With the highest and noblest aims in 1914-18, America failed to achieve her purpose because *she sat at the peace-table as a belligerent.* This time let us see to it that we sit at the peace-table as a neutral, the friend not of any warring state, but of stricken humanity alone.

SOME QUESTIONS ANSWERED

It may be well for us to learn the lessons already taught in these initial stages of the European war. One is an answer at last to the old familiar charge that, if the Asquith ministry in 1914 had made unmistakable to the Kaiser its intention to support France in any war against her, there would have been no war. This has threatened all these years to remain one of the unanswered riddles of history. But now the answer has come. Chamberlain never faltered in his declaration to Hitler that, if Germany attacked Poland, Britain would spring to Poland's aid. It made no difference —war came just the same! Again, there was the assertion last September (1938) that England and France should have stood up to Hitler and yielded not an inch to his Sudeten claims. This man, we were told, understands no language but force. Instead of going to Munich, Chamberlain should have marshalled his fleet and mobilized his army, and Hitler would have yielded. But this same Chamberlain this fall talked the language of force, and talked it vigorously. Hitler may have understood, but he did not yield! Still again, we have been told that at Berchtesgarten and at Munich Hitler was bluffing. Vincent Sheean renews this charge in his recent book. We never saw any evidence that this was true, nor indeed have we ever been able to understand how anybody could know that Hitler was bluffing except Hitler himself. But now the riddle is solved! Hitler was *not* bluffing. Under conditions more serious than in 1938, he went to war in 1939. What all this means is very simple. Force never gets us anywhere. It never brings peace, but only war. To threaten force is the next step only to using force, and to use force is to meet the barbarian on his own ground and reduce the world to the anarchy which is his native *milieu.* Yet force is all the language we know, the only method we use, to settle our disputes. The trouble with the international world is simple—it has no instruments of peace and good will at its disposal, but only instruments of force, violence, hate, destruction, and death. Never have these instruments brought us anything but the worst. Yet we suppose that to the end of time we shall be told that the way to secure peace is to prepare for war, and that to the end of time any statesman who so much as tries another way will be insulted and maligned.

THE TREASON OF RUSSIA

The Russian Non-Aggression Pact with Nazi Germany, coupled with the trade agreement between the two countries—the equivalent of an alliance, as witness Hitler's picking of Russia as one of his representatives, along with Italy, in the peace terms of August 31st last! —all this constitutes a final disillusionment as regards the Soviets. Our first disillusionment came with the famous "purges"—that series of incredible trials and

executions which wiped out all the great leaders of the old Bolshevist regime. Apologies for and defenses of this unspeakable horror simply did not get anywhere. It remained what it was—a crime such as had once ruined the French Revolution and carried it straight over to the military dictatorship of Napoleon! After years of ardent sympathy with the Russian revolution and costly championship of its cause, we felt ourselves betrayed. So far as internal domestic policy was concerned, wherein was Stalin any better than the tsars? What remained, or seemed to remain, out of all this wreckage of our hope was Russia's foreign policy. The Soviets, under Litvinov, were still the friends of peace, and the enemies of Japan on the east and of Germany on the west. However dark Stalin's dictatorship within, his leadership without was on the side of order and good will, and his principle of utter trustworthiness something new in international diplomacy. But now all this has gone! Litvinov has had to join the rest of the veteran Bolsheviks, of whom he alone remained. What we see, in stark and dreadful horror, is a Russia which is just like all the rest of the countries in the international field—unscrupulous, secretive, double-dealing, cunning, cynical, seeking the main chance, ready to strike any bargain at the moment profitable, concerned with the old familar quest of world power and world dominance. *Think* of Lenin's Russia clasping hands with Hitler's Reich! THINK of the Swastika waving over the Kremlin in Moscow, and the Hammer and Sickle over the Wilhelmstrasse in Berlin!! After a month's contemplation the thing still seems too fantastic to be believed and too ghastly to be borne. But there it is—a spectacle so shattering to human confidence and hope as well-nigh to banish all faith from out the heart. In the face of such betrayal, there is but one truth to state and one course to follow. We join the *Nation* and the *New Republic*, and all liberal opinion everywhere, in washing our hands of Russia.

THE COMMUNISTS

The chief sufferers from the Russian tragedy are of course the Communists in many lands who sincerely, devotedly, heroically, have put their trust in the Kremlin and Stalin as Roman Catholics put their trust in the Vatican and the Pope. We could sympathize with these hard-beset followers of an ideal if they were now honest enough to confess that they have been sold out. We would pity them, as we pity anybody whose confidence is betrayed and heartbroken. But when these same Communists insist that nothing at all has happened, that the treaties with the Reich are wholly in accord with Communist principles, that Moscow's trade agreement to supply Germany with everything she needs is consistent with the Communists' feverish advocacy of an organized embargo against Germany, that the Non-Aggression Pact is in reality a weakening of Fascism and an attack upon it, we can feel nothing but contempt for these Communists, and spew them out of our mouth in sickening disgust. Why, it was this very summer that the *Daily Worker* (official Communist organ in New York) said this: "The whispered lies to the effect that the Soviet Union will enter into a treaty with Nazi Germany is nothing but poison spread by the enemies of peace and democracy, the appeasement mongers, the Munich men of Fascism." And now the *Daily Worker,* in editorial after editorial, is swallowing the poison and calling it good food. Look at the whirligig of Communist thought in recent years! First, it was attack all along the line on all groups not strictly and officially Communistic — a sweeping and ceaseless onslaught on Socialists, liberals, workers, everybody not toeing the party line. Then came the united front against Fascism—a joining of hands with all liberal and bourgeois groups which were opposed to the black and brown shirted enemy, a common cause on behalf of democracy. Now comes the swing to the side of Fascism! The Communists are lined up with the Nazis in a trade agreement to supply their needs, and must henceforth stand neutral in any fight against them. And the Communist leaders in this country and in England, and we suppose in other countries, are standing for it! Well, leaders must obey orders in the Communist Party, else be exiled and ruined. But it's different with the rank and file. We prophesy an exit of honest and heart-sick souls from this organization of hypocrisy which will leave it as weak as it is now disgraced.

Friends of America, Stand By!
(September 1, 1939)

A mammoth dragon threatens the world.
Across the nations his bulk is hurled.

Peoples north and peoples south
Writhe in his bloated, bloody mouth.

Peoples east and peoples west
Strangle against his scaly breast.

Wherever he goes the giants stalk:
Famine, white as a piece of chalk.

Disease and Rape and branding Pain
Creep along in his slimy train.

Friends of America, stand by!
The dragon's fire has smirched the sky.

Friends of America, unite!
The dragon's breath may blur our sight.

Hear him bellow, hear him roar—
Keep him away from our country's shore!

Keep him away with his shot and his shell;
Keep America out of hell!

LUCIA TRENT

The World Significance of the German-Russian Pact*

TARAKNATH DAS

On Sunday, August 20, 1939, two news items of great significance were reported from Moscow: (1) The Soviet Russian government had some misgivings regarding any satisfactory conclusion of an Anglo-French-Russian agreement, because of the disagreement between Russia and Britain regarding the guaranty against "indirect aggression" in the Baltic States as demanded by Russia. (2) A commercial agreement was signed, by which Russia agreed to supply Germany raw materials of manganese ore, iron ore, oil, lumber, etc., and in return to purchase German manufactured goods and machines of all kinds for which Germany would extend a credit of some $80,000,000. It was reported that the commercial agreement had no political significance. At the same time *Pravda* published articles intimating that this commercial agreement might be the beginning of some far-reaching political understanding. The same paper also published articles to the effect that Russia could not trust Great Britain, because the government of Neville Chamberlain was secretly negotiating with Germany to sacrifice Poland, as it did sacrifice Czechoslovakia in the Munich Conference of 1938. These news items and the articles mentioned above had special significance, because the Anglo-French group of powers were engaged in negotiating with Soviet Russia to win the latter over to their side so that England, France, Russia, Poland, Turkey, Roumania, Greece, and other powers might make a common cause against the Rome-Berlin axis and check the assertion of German hegemony in Central Europe. Furthermore, Germany, in order to counteract the Anglo-French policy of winning over Soviet Russia, was also negotiating with Russia, so that German-Russian amity might be established, thereby strengthening Germany's position in world politics.

On the 21st of August, the whole world was stunned by the news from Berlin and Moscow that within a few days Germany and Russia would sign a non-aggression pact, and the German Foreign Minister Herr von Ribbentrop would leave Berlin on Wednesday, the 23rd, by airplane for Moscow where he would sign the treaty. The significance of this pact in world politics can be easily estimated. It will revolutionize the present trend of world politics; and I shall try to give a very brief estimate of it.

(1) The immediate effect of this Non-Aggression Pact between Soviet Russia and Germany, if finally ratified, would mean German victory over Poland regarding German claims for Danzig and the Polish corridor, without fighting or by crushing Poland, if the latter dares to oppose Germany. The Anglo-French governments would not be able to aid Poland effectively. Even before any military aid could be sent to Poland by these powers, Germany would be able to crush Poland militarily. If Poland decides to fight Germany and the Anglo-French governments decide to extend aid to Poland, Germany would take a merely defensive stand in the West and then crush Poland completely.

The ultimate effect of surrender of Poland to Germany, through negotiations or after a war, would result in reducing Poland to a state economically and politically dependent upon Germany. One may cynically assert that in the future Germany might decide to repartition Poland, dividing the country between Russia and herself.

(2) The German-Russian Pact would not only strengthen Germany's position in proportion to the weakening of the independent existence of Poland, but would also make Germany more powerful in the Baltic. German influence in Finland, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania would increase; and Germany would not have any fear of Russian submarines in the Baltic, obstructing Germany's communications with Sweden, which is a vital factor in the matter of supplying iron ore and other raw materials to the Reich. German-Russian coöperation in the Baltic would force the Scandinavian countries to side with Germany or at least observe strict neutrality in case of any conflict between Germany and any of the Western Powers.

(3) The German-Russian Pact would seriously affect Roumania. It should not be forgotten that Roumania is still in alliance with Poland—an alliance directed against Soviet Russia. After crippling Poland, it would be of vital interest for Germany to bring Roumania under her control so that not only Roumanian resources—oil and agricultural products—would be under German control, but Roumania would be reduced to a virtual German protectorate and Germany would be able to establish herself in the Black Sea region. It would not be surprising at all if, in order to secure the Non-Aggression Pact with Russia, Germany has not only assured Russia that she would not try to detach Ukraine from Soviet Russia, but would not be opposed to the return of parts of Poland and Basarabia to Russia.

It is certain that due to the signing of the Non-Aggression Pact between Germany and Russia, Roumania cannot expect any help from Russia. Roumania is a member of the Balkan Entente composed of Turkey, Greece, Roumania, and Yugoslavia. It is well-known that neither Greece nor Yugoslavia is in position to aid Roumania against Germany. Turkey may be willing to aid Roumania against an attack by Bulgaria; but it is not conceivable that Turkey would be willing to aid Roumania against Germany, with Russia maintaining benevolent neutrality. Roumania may receive Anglo-French aid through the Black Sea ports, in spite of Italian opposition but before any effective aid could reach Roumania from the Anglo-French allies, Germany single-handed or with the aid of Bulgaria and Hungary would crush Roumania, as the army of von Mackenson did during the World War. Therefore, through control over Roumania, Germany would augment her political and economic influence in the Balkans as well as in the regions of the Black Sea.

(4) It is needless to emphasize that after crushing opposition in Poland and Roumania, it would not be difficult for Germany to bring Hungary, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia within the orbit of German influence. In this connection, it may be noted that Germany would be willing to respect the minor influence of Italy in the Balkans and aid Italy to expand in certain sections of the Balkans, adjoining Albania and also in Africa.

In short, the net result of the German-Russian Pact, if ratified, would be Russian recognition of a German Monroe Doctrine for Central Europe, by which Russia would recognize Germany's special position in

*The main body of this article was written August 21, 1939. Note the concluding comments.—*Editor.*

Central Europe between the Baltic and the Black Seas, on condition that Germany would respect Russian frontiers and would not side with Russia's enemies.

If Russia recognizes Germany's special position in Central Europe, and Germany agrees to respect Russian frontiers, this would have tremendous consequences in European politics.

(1) It would mean that Germany would have no fear of Russian aggression and thus she would be able to use her military force as a diplomatic weapon against the Anglo-French allies, regarding the restitution of German colonies and German territories still held by them.

(2) It would mean that both Germany and Italy would use their pressure on France and England in the solution of various problems affecting their interests in Africa and in the Mediterranean.

Germany, free from the fear of an attack by Russia and aided by Russian coöperation in securing raw materials, will be infinitely stronger to face France and England. Furthermore, a possible German-Italian-Spanish combination against France and England would force the Anglo-French allies to surrender to German and Italian and Spanish demands regarding African colonies.

(3) Recently Turkish foreign policy has been pro-British and pro-French, because the British have extended financial and political support to Turkey, and France has ceded Alexandretta and a portion of Syria to buy Turkish friendship. But if Germany and Russia agree not to fight, then Turkey would have to give up a policy which might be unfriendly to Germany. This might mean that Turkey would have to agree not to fight against Germany in case Germany should be involved in a war with the Anglo-French bloc of powers.

(4) If Turkey follows the policy of coöperation with Russia and Germany, and if Persia and Afghanistan which are allied with Turkey and friendly to Soviet Russia, also decide to coöperate with Germany, then the British position in India might be seriously threatened. It must not be forgotten that the Arabs, including the Iraqis, might join the anti-British forces led by Germany.

(5) If India with her 350,000,000 people were properly armed and trained, in case of an emergency, she might defy the combination of forces of Germany, Russia, and Turkey arrayed against the British Empire. But as things stand today, and unless the British win over the Indian people by making adequate concessions and institute military training of the type adopted by Japan and other nations, Britain would not be able to protect India against the combined strength of Germany, Russia, and their allies. Indian statesmen should not depend upon British aid for their national defense, but adopt immediate measures of adequate national defense under Indian control by instituting compulsory military training in high schools and colleges, and other measures. India should demand that Britain should aid her with money, military experts and modern weapons to become a formidable military power. If this is not done now, within a few years India may become another China subject to invasion, or another Czechoslovakia, Poland, or Roumania.

Due to the signing of the Russian-German Pact, and the virtual elimination of German-Russian rivalry in the Balkans, Soviet Russia will feel free to exert her full efforts to strengthen her position in Asia, particularly in the Far East by penetrating into China and opposing Japan.

It is to be expected that Herr Hitler, following the policy of Germany under Kaiser Wilhelm, will encourage Russia to expand in the Far East, challenging Japan in Asia. Under the circumstances, Japan will have to make a choice from several alternatives:

(1) Japanese statesmen and militarists might decide (as advocated by Prince Ito before the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 and Baron Goto after the World War) to forget their difficulties with Russia and make an understanding with the German-Russian bloc, with the specific agreement that both Germany and Russia would acknowledge Japan's special interests in certain sections of China.

(2) Distrustful of Soviet Russia and Germany, and fearing an eventual Russo-Japanese War in which Russia will receive German support and the coöperation of a certain section of the Chinese, some of the Japanese statesmen might prefer to come to an understanding with the Anglo-French bloc of powers as well as the United States and China. By such a policy Japan would feel free, in case of necessity, to face Soviet Russia in a combat.

(3) Some of the Japanese statesmen will prefer not to commit Japan to any definite policy which may involve Japan in any European conflict. They will advocate that Japan should do her best to finish the Chinese War as soon as possible and try to cultivate friendship with a Chinese Government which would be willing to sign a non-aggression pact with Japan, if not to form an alliance with Japan. Then Japan, Manchukuo, China, and Siam could form a bloc under Japan's leadership to protect their mutual interests.

These statesmen might even advocate that Japan should coöperate with the people of India, so that Indian man power, resources, and strategic position might not be used against Japan and her allies.

Should Russia, supported by Germany, try to secure control over any part of China or act against Japanese interests in Asia, these Japanese statesmen, to check Russia, might even seek the coöperation of the Anglo-French bloc of powers as well as that of the United States.

If a German-Russian-Japanese alliance develops, it is quite possible that it would result in the elimination of the colonial possessions of France, Great Britain, Holland, and the United States in the Far East. But it would mean that Germany would demand colonies in the Far East and also the strengthening of Russia which might later on challenge Japan's power in the Far East.

As things stand today in the Far East, unless the British and the French agree to coöperate with Japan in ending the Sino-Japanese conflict and to recognize Japan's special position, it cannot be expected that Japan will join the Anglo-French bloc of powers against the German-Russian bloc.

It seems to me that any development leading to German-Russian coöperation in world politics would force the Anglo-French bloc of powers to seek the support of Japan, making adequate concessions to the latter.

The German-Russian Pact would affect American foreign policy very seriously. President Roosevelt's foreign policy has been to aid the Anglo-French bloc of powers (so-called democracies) against Germany and Italy (Fascist Powers). The Roosevelt administration

has been friendly to Russia, which has been opposed to Germany and Japan. If Germany and Russia come to an understanding politically and establish closer economic relations, it would hurt American economic interests.

If the German-Russian Pact develops into a German-Russian alliance directed against Britain and her ally France, America will feel inclined to side with the Anglo-French group of powers against Russia and Germany.

In such an eventuality both groups of powers—the German-Russian group and the Anglo-American-French group—would seek Japan's support. If the Anglo-American-French group of powers makes Japan their enemy, then Japan may join the German-Russian group and menace British, French and American possessions in the Far East. If on the other hand the German-Russian bloc of powers act against Japan's interest, then Japan may not only join the Anglo-American-French bloc of powers but may even fight Russia in the Far East which would weaken the German-Russian bloc.

In conclusion one may say that the German-Russian Pact might even widen its scope to include other powers such as China and Turkey to bring about the isolation of Britain. Britain has an alliance with France and other powers, and the support of the United States. But, unless Britain and her allies succeed in securing the support of Asian powers, especially Japan, India and the Moslem bloc of powers in the Middle East, it would be difficult for her to maintain her Empire. A German-Russian alliance receiving the support and aid of Asian powers, particularly Japan, China, India, and the Middle Eastern Moslem powers, could bring about the end of the British Empire. This being the case, the German-Russian Pact increases the importance of Asia, especially Japan, India, and Turkey, in world politics. In the coming possible conflict among western powers, the balance of power will rest with Asia, primarily with Japan and India.

Note: Since writing the above, developments make necessary the addition of the following observations:

1. The text of the treaty has been published in the daily press. One important point of this Non-Aggression Pact is that it has no so-called "escape clause," according to which, if one of the signatories commits an unprovoked aggression upon a third power, the other will not be bound by the treaty. Furthermore the treaty provides that signatories will not extend any direct or indirect aid to their enemies. Owing to the existence of this provision, Japan considers that the so-called anti-Comintern Pact has been violated by Germany; while the Anglo-French powers have discontinued their negotiations for a mutual assistance pact with Soviet Russia. Some diplomats think that the German-Russian Pact is virtually a German-Russian alliance.

2. It has been rumored that Germany has agreed to return the Polish Ukraine to Soviet Russia and also to recognize Russian influence in some of the Baltic States.

3. Germany has sent Herr von Papen to Ankara to induce the Turkish Government to desert the Anglo-French bloc and join the German-Soviet bloc. Turkey has refused to follow German policy and to desert her allies. In the future Turkey may have to desert Soviet Russia.

4. Japan has protested against Germany's signing the Non-Aggression Pact with Soviet Russia. It is apparent that Japan will not support Germany which is now a virtual ally of Soviet Russia.

5. Japan is going to play a "lone hand" to promote her interests in Asia and will not be tied up with any one of the western powers. This means that she will carry out her "New Asia Policy," ignoring Western Powers.

6. It has been reported that several squadrons of bombing planes and 3,000 soldiers from India have been sent to Singapore to strengthen its defense. Recently several thousand soldiers from India have been dispatched to the Near East. It is understood that the military forces of India will serve as the most important factor in preserving British interests in the Near East, Africa, and the Mediterranean. If Turkey decides to fight for the Anglo-French bloc of powers and needs support, it is expected that Indian soldiers would reinforce Turkish military forces.

7. The Soviets have ratified the pact with Germany.

Religion Answers Force

WALLACE W. ROBBINS

The changes of public opinion under the pressure of propaganda are hardly a test for the directions of truth. A few years ago it was a highly unpopular thing to point to the great conflict growing between totalitarian government operated by brute force and the religious way of life. One who spoke against the American equivalents of the illiberal, undemocratic ways of national and private living was apt to secure for himself emotionally-laden epithets that were not pleasant. During the Red scare of a few years ago, the one who protested that Fascism came quickest to the country that tried to save itself by persecution of these so-called Red minorities was looked upon as Red himself.

It may be that the new change in public opinion will bring new epithets, for, since then, our nation has become aware that a free people cannot live under oppressive force, that the revival of the concept of State as holy above God and humanity is retrogressive, that the way of religious brotherhood cannot for long endure under the iron heel of a militaristic government. To be against totalitarian government has become an approved, even a popular, thing now.

But, in this shift from reactionary, fearful thoughtlessness to highly-whipped emotional disapproval of dictatorship, those of us who have been insisting upon a clear look at the means and ends of Fascism as being opposed to religion can find little in which to rejoice. The sudden shift to anti-Fascism has none of the elements of a love for the positive that mark the religious life. It is based on hatred, mob-fear, and emotional hysteria that become the fruitful soil in which dictatorial force finds its roots.

Liberals who have opposed Fascism and force long before it was popular to do so can hardly be accused of promoting it now when the anti-Fascists fall under the liberal's censure.

In this country's "viewings with alarm" of the European and Asiatic forms of oppressive government, in the violent acts against foreign social forms within our borders, the liberal sees clearly-defined portents of the coming of a brute force that will stamp out a free people's government and religion just as surely as the anti-Red activities that marked the years 1934 and 1935.

Today we face the paradox of seeing the emotional change of weather that would stamp out foreign means of force becoming such a storm that no freedom can remain untouched and, in the very whirlwind, at its destructive center, we see brute force established in the name of protecting democracy.

This emotional storm is spreading over two areas of society: the one area is marked by our own borders, and the other area is limited by international policy.

One of the marks of power-dictatorship is the development of weak minorities into passionately-hated scapegoats. In the totalitarian state of Germany, the helpless Jew has served this medieval purpose. Brutality and force, exercised upon the Jew, have marked the decline of religion and the growing power of ruthless force.

Within our own borders, recently, we have seen the same brutalizing of men taking place on this same basis. The Nazi-American Folksbund, whose misguided purposes we deplore, met in St. Louis and, more recently, in New York City, to promulgate an American Fascist state. Equally well meaning and stupid people who are infected with the present popularity of anti-Fascism broke up the St. Louis meeting with force and fretted against the police guard around Madison Square Garden.

Now it makes no real difference whether bigotry and brutual intolerance are directed toward the Jew or the anti-Semitic, the fact that either minority in this country falls under a persecution augurs the development of an anti-religious desire to raise demonic hatred to the status of a divine emotion. Anti-Reds, anti-Fascists, and anti-Jews belong to the same class and would promote a state of ruthless power that is exactly what religion cannot stand.

The public has been badly frightened by the fate of Austria, Spain, and Czechoslovakia. It has, at long last, become apparent that Germany and Italy intend to divide Europe between them, with central Europe going to Germany and control of the Mediterranean going to Italy. All this is the direct result of Europe's failure to accept the honorable peace terms suggested by America at Versailles, but this is now overlooked and the general fear which exists in American hearts has turned to hatred for the names of any political party or social group that tends to remind them of their fear.

This fear and the resulting hatred conspire to stop foreign Fascism with American Fascism and, whether the swastika or the stars and stripes is waved in the name of tyranny, the result is still Fascism. It makes no difference what group of people is persecuted, or how or in what name brute force comes to rule over even-tempered judgment, the religious way of life cannot stand before it.

Stopping parades and meetings of those who would establish the dictatorship of Fascism or its twin, Sovietism, will but foster the very thing we oppose. We may as well label our stores "Fascists driven out. Opened under American management" as label them "Jews driven out. Opened under Aryan management." It is the same thing.

Our people have become opposed to force and, in their negative minds, tend to destroy the way of life that they should protect. It is well to be against it by the constructive substitute of a better way, but this general negativistic attitude has alarmingly infected the policies of state, and America is preparing for war: preparing for a war to again make the world "safe for democracy."

The naval rearmament bill has laid plans for a navy that, according to expert testimony, will be of chief use in foreign waters and is not intended for the defense of American shores. Coupling the administration's backing of this aggressive force with the President's Chicago speech on "quarantining" Fascist nations, we see that the plan is to stop Fascism by the collective force of the present democratic nations.

Add to this recipe the Bill for the mobilization of America in time of war, falsely called an act to take the profits out of war, and see what we have as an international policy leading directly to authoritative government.

The Bill for mobilization does not take the profits out of war, it actually raises them five per cent by law. It gives the President control of business, industry, banking, and labor. He may fix wages and prices, take over property, muzzle the press. He can draft men to work in factories or be shot in the trenches. More than this, the new form of forceful regimentation of life in America will last until the war is declared officially over by Congress. That was two years after the Armistice in the last war.

As Elmer Davis points out in an article in *Harpers:*

> If we were defending our shores against a Fascist world, this might be necessary; we could afford to sacrifice even democracy if we were fighting for a national existence. But it seems all out of proportion to any war in which we are likely to be engaged.

The fact is that our well-meaning leaders, setting themselves up as defenders of democracy, have laid careful plans to stop Fascism by force on foreign soil and in foreign waters—and the price of stopping this Fascism will be the firm establishment of American regimentation in the very act of that noble war.

The fact is, also, that America is in no danger from Fascism being imposed by an outside power. New York is no Minz, Austria, and Washington is no Vienna to welcome Germany's dictator. Neither is any possible civil commotion within America to be fed by the money, soldiers, and direction of Mussolini.

Burke's thousands of miles of ocean still roll between America and Europe. To cross those miles again to defend democracy in Europe and promote the immediate death of democracy in our own country is not good sense.

It is not good sense, but it springs from good intentions. The good intentions are that the world shall still be made safe for democracy even if democracy must be sacrificed. The bugles of a crusade are blowing and men are thoughtlessly reaching for the swords that turn democracy, as by magic, into a state of brutal force.

The growing desire to make war on totalitarian government, both within and beyond the borders of America, is diametrically opposed to free religion, and we find ourselves now set to the tremendous task of keeping our country from the greatest folly that she has ever envisioned. Religion's life is at stake, and the movement toward peace, brotherhood, opportunity, and happy usefulness hinges on the most dangerous thing

that can psychologically happen to men—good intentions without intelligence.

Actually, this country is not in danger from either military or effective propaganda invasion, and the danger is not imminent abroad. The well-intended, stupid enthusiasms of our own people will go further to wreck everything that they mean to save, for we are faced with moral collapse within rather than attack from without. I have already pointed to the most glaring examples of that collapse in domestic and international symptoms: the negative spirit of the persecution of unpopular minorities and the destructive intention of a foreign policy which claims that the totalitarian nations need quarantining because of the infection they picked up at Versailles.

Our first duty is to keep our heads and not be led into the mob-frenzy of the hour. But our second duty is no less touched with immediacy, and that is to demonstrate the value of the humanitarian ideal as a practical way of life.

The humanitarian way in government is democracy and, in every social aspect of life, it calls for trust in the essential decency of human beings and a respect for our own personalities as well as others in their differences.

The times call for a positive manifestation of the humanitarian way.

There is too much talk about defending democracy. Democracy was never intended to be defended. It was meant to be lived. We are failing to take democracy seriously. We leave the management of city, town, county, and state affairs to those people who, for any reason, good or bad, want to manage it. Men who have not bothered to master the grammatical construction of English are elected to the Board of Aldermen of our cities because no one else cares to stand for election. Party politics are open to everyone, but only one or two people out of hundreds bother to take active part in the forming of policies for which the whole country must vote. The duty of the man who believes in democracy is plainly to take part in the democratic processes by running for office or helping to plan the policies which run his city and nation.

If we cannot find time to spend one or two evenings a month in the Council of the city planning for the needs of our neighbors, we can never make democracy into a going concern, and, above all things, how can we believe that this democracy which is not worth eight hours out of every seven hundred and twenty is worth years of trench life and death? If any one says he has patriotic feelings, let him demonstrate it now.

The warring economic factions which threaten to split American life in twain have left most of us indifferent to the social import of the strife. Here democracy—the humanitarian way—is under serious stress, and the middle class which holds the balance of power is satisfied to shout, "A plague on both your houses, Mercutio" and go its self-satisfied way in dilettante fashion. Yet, with this bellowing of the economic beasts at war, the walls of Jericho may fall and democracy will be but a grandfather's tale to his grandson of days that once held promise. What constructive part have we who hold the purse strings of economic life played in this drama? What real understanding have we found in the issue?

One who would make democracy real must plunge into the problem of economic peace, and insist that differences be settled at least as quietly as a dispute about a fence line between neighbors.

The danger to democracy lies within, not only our national border, economic boundaries, and political wards but within ourselves. "Respect for the essential decency of human beings and a respect for our own personalities as well as the personalities of others"—do we have such respect? In varying degrees we have. At least those of us who, adopting the attitudes of free men, do not insist upon ramming creeds into our fellow human being's minds, nor yet making religion a ceremony to which our friends must dance when we pipe the tune. We have respected our fellows enough to let them make their own prayers. We search for our own true way of contributing to life and we feel that others have the same right. These are high virtues of freedom, but they are not the highest. Respect for the essential decency of human beings does not consist merely of allowing them to remain unencumbered. Real respect is a much more affirmative affair. We need to encourage the decency of others by positive manifestations of our attitude.

In times past the American freeman built his attitude of human respect into great tangible organizations even as the middle ages created the mystery of God in soaring arch and lofty spire. The greatest universities in the land, the public educational system, the libraries, the schools for the blind, great charitable foundations—these were the work of liberals who proved their humanitarian beliefs in positive encouragement of the innate qualities of good in others. The result was the flowering of democracy and the fragrance of a liberal religion. The past has been a glorious one, but it is today that now presses hard upon us. What are we going to do to prove that the democratic ideal still lives and opposes the way of force with the way of peaceful industry and creative human life?

There is great need in American cities for a school for the people in intelligent citizenship—adult voters need to be educated in civics. It is not necessary to have great funds to start a school that would set a standard for the country. A little consecrated man power would do the trick.

There is great need for adult education in economic problems. The people are eager to understand what economic social life is based upon, and we have men of ability to train them. Again, no great wealth is necessary to start such a school for adults, only man power willing to expend itself in the name of human respect.

There is great need to learn self-sufficiency in home life—amusements, reading, common projects, a real family life. We have people who know the value of a family hearth in the midst of a changing social age who could help set a great example for the country if they would but lead the way in some humble beginning of social direction for the people of our country.

If the tavern becomes the educational center for the community, and the ignorant politician the leader of the people, if force runs democracy to the wall and stabs it, if war turns America into a tyrant's roost, we liberals will be to blame. We cannot be satisfied with a negative liberalism or an innocuous religion. It is not our tradition; it is not our deepest conviction.

If we would be inwardly true to the great responsibility we have implanted in our hearts, we must keep alive the glowing lights of freedom by feeding the flame with creative effort. The negative force of opposing that which we feel to be dangerous to religion is not enough. We must illustrate by our own lives the way which we hold to be better. It is no easy way. It

calls for sacrifice of petty pleasures and of self-used time, but the sacrifice is small compared to the loss of freedom, manhood, and human respect before the power of hate, war, and Fascism.

Religion's answer to force cannot be more force, but more religion. No Fascism can compete with a successful democracy. No tyranny can subdue a purposeful, intelligent, self-governing people. Propaganda cannot cope with a people who have been encouraged to rise to their own decency. Religion cannot be submerged if it is buoyant with active faith.

Let the Fascists meet and parade. Let them remake the map of Europe, but let us remake our own lives and assist a decent people to lead a decent life.

This is our task and our highest calling to prove to the world that man is capable of aspiring to divinity and, in his own heart, able to touch with active prayers the ideal of God.

The Democratic Dilemma*

DAVID M. BLOCH

Democracy today is being challenged on all sides, and unless we meet that challenge our civilization is in danger of being destroyed. One need not be a prophet of gloom to hold this view. The signs of the times confirm it, and only those stricken with mental or moral atrophy will fail to heed the warning. The gravity of the situation calls for immediate action. We in the democratic lands can least afford to remain neutral while our liberties, yes, even our lives, are at stake. We must, if we are at all concerned about our civilization, courageously face our enemies, analyze their motives, their conflicting ideologies, and see whether it is still possible to ward off the impending catastrophe.

The most salient foes we need to reckon with in our present crisis, needless to say, are the totalitarian regimes. But in order to launch a successful attack against them, it is necessary that we have a clear understanding of their respective doctrines. Otherwise, like Don Quixote, we shall merely dissipate our energies in fighting windmills instead of real knights. Too many liberals do that very thing when they attempt to appraise these modern tyrannies. Though they avow their dislike for Naziism and Fascism, they fail to point out clearly the dangers lurking in these sinister movements. Communism on the other hand is either glorified by them, or else equally condemned with Fascism. This superficial analysis only confuses the real issue and leads us nowhere. As we pry further into the nature of the authoritarian states embracing these ideologies, we shall see that National Socialism and Fascism need to be criticized much more severely if we are to be able to meet their challenge. We shall also see that Communism is by no means the lily-white or pitch-black philosophy depicted by our confused liberals.

Of the three leading dictatorships, there is no doubt that the Nazi and Fascist are by far the cruelest and most menacing. In Germany and Italy alike, the Jews and other minorities are relentlessly persecuted, all civil rights are suppressed, and liberty lies prostrated beneath the iron heels of its dictators. Both states advocate an economy of scarcity, enslave labor, and glorify war. Its leaders, paying homage to crude pagan gods of antiquity, mock our religion and liberal traditions. Preaching the gospel of hate, they are determined, by fair means or foul, to undermine our institutions and impose their way of life upon us.

Though less menacing than its two rivals, the Soviet State is also antagonistic towards democracy. If some of its protagonists lately have become ardent admirers of our liberal institutions, it is only because of expediency that they have adopted this attitude. They still hold a silent contempt for many of the ideals we liberals cherish. So vital a force of Western civilization as religion, for instance, was, and still is, discredited by the principal theoreticians of the Communist credo. According to the teachings of Communism, religion is but a bourgeois invention to help chloroform the minds of the workers so that they can be more easily exploited. Hence the inspired pronunciamento by Marx, so greedily swallowed by his followers: "Religion is the opium of the people." To this very day the Russian government discourages the teaching of religion and bears down heavily upon all ecclesiastical institutions.

Yet in spite of its shortcomings, the Soviet commonwealth has achieved much that is noteworthy. Russia's agriculture and industry are based upon an economy of abundance, and the lot of its workers, though far from enviable, is better than that of their comrades in the Fascist countries. No one can deny, of course, that in the Soviet Union the people are as completely under the subjection of the state as those of Germany or Italy. But it is well to remember that, unlike the Fascist countries, Russia, at least, has prospects for a brighter future. The Russian leaders constantly reiterate that theirs is but a temporary dictatorship; that upon completion of their program, all civil rights will be granted to its citizens.

Whether this promise will be fulfilled, time alone will tell. The unbiased observer, however, acquainted with their philosophy, must admit that their hope of a freer Russia in the very near future is not entirely groundless. Modern Communism, in spite of its anti-democratic trend, is deeply rooted in liberalism. It cannot, therefore, divorce itself altogether from democracy. We must not forget that the early Utopian Communists were staunch democrats. Even Marx, Engels, and Lenin, with all their vituperative outbursts against Western democracy, visualized a future society basically democratic. It is possible, then, that the Russian Communists may yet redeem themselves and rectify the many serious blunders they have committed. There may yet come a day when the Russian lion

*This article is an able and important statement of the viewpoint in the present crisis of a large and perhaps growing section of liberalism in this country. UNITY disagrees with certain aspects of this program, notably the restriction of civil liberties, but believes discussion of the issues is vital.—*Editor.*

and the democratic lamb will lie peacefully side by side.

From our analysis of the three corporate ideologies, it can be readily seen that it is principally the Nazis and Fascists that need to engage our immediate attention. It is they and not the Communists who seriously threaten our democracy. We can afford, therefore, to discount the Communist challenge for the time being, and apply all our strategic maneuvers solely against our other opponents. And, though it may sound a bit paradoxical, it is the Communists, as we shall later discover, that must be won over on our side, if the fight against the Nazis and Fascists is to be brought to a successful climax.

Before we attempt to discuss ways and means to combat Fascism, it is well that we focus our attention for a while on those enemies within and without our borders, who do not happen to belong in the totalitarian camp. They, too, as we shall see, are deadly foes of democracy, and it is with them that we shall now deal.

Thus, imperialism is an obnoxious weed in the garden of humanity, which, if left unchecked, may finally devour the flower of our civilization. Masquerading in the guise of democracy, it thrives on war and economic exploitation. Those who direct its policy are guilty of nearly every crime mentioned in the calendar. Pretending to be concerned about civilization, these wolves in sheep's clothing have been constantly preying upon weaker nations. Mention China, India, the Congos in Africa, Cuba, and the Philippine Islands, and immediately pictures of horror and oppression float before our vision. To this very day the natives in these unfortunate lands are being mercilessly exploited by the imperialist powers of Japan, England, France, and America. And it is these same sinister forces in these democratic countries (Japan being the only corporate state) who are indirectly responsible for the rise of Hitler and Mussolini. Had it not been for the Versailles Treaty—a product of imperialism—with its unjust commitments, the world certainly would not be the armed camp it is today. Neither would the rape of Austria, Ethiopia, Czechoslovakia, Spain, Albania, and the war in China have occurred without the sanction of these same selfish interests.

Trailing behind these enemies of free institutions are the pseudo-liberals who believe that they can serve both God and Mammon. Proclaiming themselves ardent champions of democracy, they nevertheless cling to the present capitalist order, so largely responsible for most of the ills in our present-day world. The mere mention of a fundamental change in the present setup gives them the jitters. Smug and overconfident, these Philistines are a good deal to blame for the moral turpitude of our times.

Yet Western democracy, in spite of its imperfections, must be preserved if our civilization is to continue, and a genuine political and industrial democracy established in Europe and America. Those of us who still retain our faith in God and man must not allow the demoniac forces that threaten our liberties to make further headway.

Our first step is to arouse public opinion in the democratic lands in favor of moral and economic sanctions against the Rome-Berlin-Tokio axis. A united democratic front against the powers in this vicious combination will help considerably to weaken their strength, and might eventually bring about their destruction. These sanctions will not, as many of our isolationists claim, necessarily lead us into war. On the contrary, if we act in time, we may prevent a future conflagration.

This blockade can be made doubly effective if we but lay aside our prejudices towards Russia and induce her to join us in this serious undertaking. Russia, too, is violently opposed to the axis, and could be a powerful ally in our common fight against the Nazi-Fascist menace.

Our next task, if we are to preserve democracy, is to curb all Nazi and Fascist activities within our borders. It is sheer madness on our part to allow these brown and black-shirted fanatics to continue their vicious propaganda. Common sense dictates that liberty should be granted only to those who do not abuse its privileges, nor deny it to others. The Nazis and Fascists have long proved themselves to be unworthy of the decent respect of mankind, and should therefore be exempted from its benefits. These mad dogs, gnawing at the vitals of our civilization, must be muzzled if democracy is to survive.

To argue, as some liberals do, that such proposals are decidedly anti-democratic, and might set precedents for further encroachments on liberty, limiting for instance all radical and even liberal activities, is beside the point. It is absolutely foolish to believe that we cease to be democratic when we expect individuals or grownups to abide by the rules of civilized society. Equally childish is the notion that anti-Fascist legislation might lead to further restrictions on liberty, culminating in a crusade against all radical and liberal movements. Those of us who know right from wrong can surely prevent any unnecessary curbs on our freedom. If the activities of progressive minorities are suppressed, as they might be, it will not be the result of anti-Fascist decrees, but rather the outcome of our own negligence in failing to safeguard our rights.

But we shall not be able to safeguard these rights and save democracy from disintegration unless we put our own democratic house in order. Sanctions against Fascism, however effective, will by no stretch of the imagination entirely solve this major problem. We cannot expect democracy to function smoothly with millions of our men unemployed, and more millions existing from hand to mouth. Such a state of affairs is bound eventually to lead us into a blind alley. Some future would-be dictator might by his rosy promises easily entice the masses in democratic lands to renounce freedom for the sake of security. This is precisely what took place in the Fascist countries, and might take place in the democratic lands, too, if we do not take the proper steps to prevent it.

A thorough house cleaning in the democratic stronghold is sorely needed, if our liberal institutions are to be preserved. It is imperative that we take control out of the hands of the imperialists who directly or indirectly shape the domestic and foreign policies of our representative governments. These gentlemen who are in the service of the

economic royalists, a class ready for the sake of profits to sacrifice civilization, must be dethroned if we are to prevent Fascism from taking root in democratic soil. If democracy is to continue, labor and the church must combine forces, and battle against these intrenched interests. The church, especially, should become more articulate in its protests against the present industrial overlords and exploiters of labor. Its ministers must cease worshipping Big Business, and, like the prophets of old, become champions of the oppressed.

Religion can yet redeem mankind and become once more a living reality, if the church will but cast aside its rigid dogmas and proclaim anew the "fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man." By renouncing modern paganism, by taking a decisive stand against war and human exploitation, this powerful agency can still prevent the breakdown of our social order, and help to make the world really safe for democracy.

The task of regenerating our anemic democracy should not, however, be left solely in the hands of labor and the church. All intellectual leaders, who are genuinely interested in the welfare of humanity and are concerned about its future, must take an active part in the struggle for human emancipation. It is time that these scholarly gentlemen get off their high pedestals, roll up their sleeves, and get ready to battle the forces of reaction. They are the guardians of our culture and should not fail, therefore, to do their duty at this most critical period in our history. For if Fascism triumphs, it will mark the end of all our hopes and dreams, and the world will plunge into another dark age.

Observations in Russia

VICTOR S. and RACHELLE S. YARROS

I

Americans who felt a real concern, or profess to do so, about the "godlessness" of the present Russian regime and its educational system, in which religion has no place, should do two things if they visit Moscow: first, talk to intelligent Russians, especially of the younger generation, on the subject of religion; and, second, make a tour of the churches that are still open for worship. These would prove eye-opening experiences.

The other day our small party asked our guide to take us to one of the more central and important churches of Leningrad. The day happened to be a Saint's Day. The church to which we were taken was that of St. Nicholas in the very heart of the city. It was packed. So was the small park in which it is situated. The service was over, but two-thirds of the worshippers did not budge. The priest, a pathetic figure, old and bent, was standing outside near the door, and at least thirty beggars —men and women—were standing or sitting on benches and soliciting alms. They unceasingly crossed themselves and mumbled supplications.

Most of the men and women in the throng were old or past middle age but not a few young girls were seen in the various groups that were slowly leaving the church or the park.

What were the people waiting for in the church? They were waiting for a chance to buy and light candles and kiss some particular ikon.

The whole spectacle was depressing and disgusting. Here, indeed, was old Russia—ignorant, illiterate, superstitious, miserably poor. The services, it should be added, were in a language that the people could not and did not understand. What does religion mean to them? How did it influence their lives? This endless self-crossing and empty invocation of "Jesus Christ" can scarcely be considered a thing worth preserving.

The government pays no attention to the open churches or to the worshippers attending the services in them. Not a soldier or police officer is in sight. The pedestrians passing the churches seem oblivious of them. No one indulges in any ridicule or any denunciation of the performances in or about the open churches. "Let the dead bury the dead" is the thought in the minds of the "irreligious." The period of anti-religious processions by students or party Communists is over.

We stopped for a few minutes in front of the Alexander II Memorial Church, a magnificent structure erected in 1881. This church is closed, but some of the people who passed it, paused, knelt, and repeatedly crossed themselves. No one molested them; no one seemed interested in their doings. They were free to pray, to kneel, to make the sign of the cross on the streets and squares of the cities.

It hardly needs pointing out that the government is well-advised in pursuing this policy. Superstition cannot be eradicated by force or insult. Education and time will dissolve it.

A word or two respecting the "godless." The young people in Russia do think that superstition and religion are synonymous terms. They declare themselves to be wholly irreligious. But they mean by this that they do not believe in a personal god; that they do not depend on any supernatural power; that they do not believe in a geographical heaven or hell; and that they refuse to speculate in an intellectual vacuum. They put their faith in science, in philosophy, in the lessons of history, and they are guided by principles which others choose to call Christian or Hebraic. They believe in humanity, justice, fraternity, and the good life. They are opposed to class rule, to privilege, to exploitation, to oppression.

They believe in making science and technology the servants of society, not the masters. They believe in extending the benefits of culture to the masses, and in encouraging and helping talent wherever it is discovered. They do not believe that the individual is born to serve the state. They believe that the state exists for the sake of the individual, and that the happiness of all individuals in society should be the sole objective of government.

They repudiate and reject Capitalism because

it has failed to bring about economic justice and social order and harmony. They are convinced that Socialism is superior to Capitalism and that in the course of time Socialism will give way to Communism. "To each according to his need" is their ideal—an ideal that implies *abundance*. For the present, Socialism—that is, to each according to his economic contribution—is all they can hope to realize. And they are slowly but surely building Socialism in Russia. There is inequality, but it is justified by existing conditions and requirements. Skill and diligence bring immediate material reward, but the unskilled and semi-skilled are given all possible aid and opportunity to acquire skill and earn the financial reward it brings.

To many, all this may suggest a form or phase of "religion." The Russians do not like the word, but names matter little. What Soviet Russia does, or is faithfully and earnestly trying to do, does matter to all of us, or at least to those of us who believe in progress and in social and economic justice.

Under the Black Flag

ROBERT C. SCHALLER

For many years past yellow-backed fiction, and of late the cinema, has exploited Jesse James, together with the scarcely less lurid Youngers, Earps, and Daltons. Seizing upon these as leaders of border warfare, post and ante-bellum, the popular imagination has almost completely neglected their sinister commander-in-chief, Quantrill, under whose black flag surged across the Southwest the entire outlaw armies of the Confederacy. And this is singular, too, since not only did he tower above all these plunder captains, but his shadow, cast far down the century in the Ku-Klux Klan and the Nazis, lies in some measure upon us all. It may be worth while, therefore, to recall some aspects of this "Attila of the plains" (as W. R. Burnett, in a recent bad novel, calls him) and the chaotic, turbulent times that he dominated.

William Clark Quantrill was born July 31, 1837, in Canal Dover, Ohio; and, after a sadistic childhood and a worthless, wasted, hand-to-mouth lionhood (including a jaunt to Utah and Pike's Peak which left a flavor of murder behind) deserted his mother to follow the career of border ruffian in Kansas Territory, by this time, thanks to Douglas' triumphant squatter sovereignty, become the battleground of the nation. Slave stealing, North and South, together with civil feuds, was the prevalent occupation in the new lands; and Quantrill's entrance nearly approximated John Brown's gruesome exploits at Ossawatomie. That grim Puritan plunderbund, however, on his headlong plunge to Harper's Ferry, immediately left the field to Quantrill, who, after sampling both sides, finally settled on the South. A minatory raid on the home of one Morgan Walker (wherein our hero gratuitously betrayed his Abolition associates) grounded him forever in the affection of the Southerners; and it is at this point that his career as guerrilla actually begins. Sumter having cried havoc and the Civil War being well under way, Quantrill now hoisted the Black Flag and summoned to its folds all bushwhackers, border ruffians, robbers, murderers, patriots, for a horror crusade on behalf of the Confederacy.

Then followed the conquests of the Quantrill horde; as Emmett Dalton terms it, "the most fearful assemblage of ruffians since Moses led his desperadoes into the Promised Land or Mohammed and his Bedouin freebooters fell upon the camel trains." After laying waste as much of Kansas as possible, Quantrill took and sacked Lawrence, W. R. Burnett's "Rome of the plains"; and they did the job with a thoroughness that rivalled (even if it did not equal) the ferocity of the Huns. Pursued by federal troops, most yet managed to make their escape; but after this Quantrill's band soon disintegrated; and he himself perished in a Kentucky foray late in 1863, leaving (as a horror-stricken historian notes) "half of his money to a former mistress, wherewith to start a house of ill-fame in St. Louis, the other half to be devoted to a monument to himself. . . ."

The soul of Quantrill goes marching on beneath the black dragon standard of the Ku-Klux Klan, which, after the World War, again erected its ugly head, only to be scotched once more. But its Black Flag, adopted by the demoralized Germans, now flies over a world-wide onslaught of outlawry upon civilization. Under the Black Flag, Hitler's host rides forth for one last assault on humanity, and the outcome of that conflict, still hanging in the balance, must decide the destiny of the world for all time.

What manner of man was this who unleashed upon his race such a flood of destruction? Of medium height, slender, handsome, nose curved and sinister, with "a most winning smile" which "in the heat of battle . . . developed into a musical laughter," and who "accompanied the sharp crackle of his weapons with the sardonic lyric of his laughter." Most interesting of all were his eyes, of a purplish gray, covered by drooping lids, yet never so veiled as to conceal the cruelty of the grave behind them. Such was William Quantrill, lord of the outlaws, generalissimo of the forces of unrest, perhaps most dreadsome destroyer since Europe and Asia quaked beneath the Scourge of God.

Witch Hunters

We dreamt a dream: that nobly we defied
The blood-lipped phantoms of a crueller age:
The witch-tormenting bonfires ceased to rage,
And moaning martyrs were no longer fried.
No shivering refugee today need hide
In bins or basements, like a beast whose cage
Was closing round; but, grown more just and sage,
All men walked hand in hand and side by side.

We dreamt a dream . . . then suddenly wake to hear
The shrieking rack, when the wrenched victim strains,
And crackling of inquisitorial chains;
While the witch hunters, nose to earth, appear,
And Hitler, trampling on torn arms and brains,
Leads the mad pack of hounds with howl and jeer.

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

The Study Table

Toward Adult Education

THEY WORKED FOR A BETTER WORLD. *By Allan Seager. New York: The Macmillan Company. 123 pp. Sixty cents.*

The Macmillan Company is carrying out a meritorious and worthwhile project, the Peoples Library. This library is to be made up of a series of books planned and edited by a committee of the American Association for Adult Education. The books are written in simple English designed for the average person who wants to understand new fields of education. Such an experiment is necessary at this time. One of America's most pressing needs is continued adult education.

The present volume by Allan Seager contains the biographies and ideals of five persons who changed America. These five, Roger Williams, Tom Paine, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Edward Bellamy, mark the story of American progress in idealism and reform. The word *reform,* however, must be used with caution since Emerson was always wary of "reformers." Each of these persons lived before his time, and now civilization is catching up. Briefly put, Williams devoted his life to the now sacred principle of separation of church and state. Paine, who is here rehabilitated, sought to make democracy a reality in America. Emerson tried to teach the youth of America the principle of "'self-reliance," to think for themselves and not to be carried away by slogans, customs, and propaganda. Elizabeth Cady Stanton began the movement for equal rights for women. From her work came the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution. Edward Bellamy is rightly included, as the author of *Looking Backward.* This book, written in 1886, is a classic in the best sense; it is timeless.

Seager's book may be had for the price of a movie. Americans may guide their intelligence by the choice they make. Let us hope that Macmillan will not grow weary in this important work of Adult Education. The present reviewer will eagerly await the arrival of each book in the series.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY

Crime, Liquor and Sex Under Repeal

DESIGNS IN SCARLET. *By Courtney Ryley Cooper. Boston: Little Brown & Company. $2.75.*

This book reads like one of the old horror tales of conditions under Prohibition. Only it is so much worse, that one might well pray that Prohibition might come again. And that's exactly what is going to happen, suggests Mr. Cooper. The Anti-Saloon League is busy again; money is rolling into its coffers; no-license territory is being steadily extended from town to town and from county to county. "The ghost comes back," is the way he puts it in one of his chapter heads. And all because the outrage of bootlegging, crime, prostitution under the protection of the liquor trade is so monstrous that public opinion will no longer stand for it. The author, be it said, is no Prohibitionist. He argues strenuously that Repeal is so bad only because it has inherited the dreadful conditions which were fostered under the "dry" regime and has made the most of them. These criminals under Repeal are Prohibition's children. Which may, or may not, be true! But the important thing is that, with Repeal, things went swiftly from bad to worse. Drinking, boozing, violations of liquor laws, bootlegging, prostitution, sex perversion, crime, all these are now at the peak. Behold—*Repeal!*

This book is a first-hand account of what is going on today in America, in saloons, opium parlors, whorehouses, "dine-and-dance" joints, cabarets, music halls, taverns, tourist camps, and other hangouts of the time. The revelation is so horrible as to seem incredible. Only the fact that Mr. Cooper has an unimpeachable record as journalist and investigator, that he did his work in close contact with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that he quotes official reports, police and court testimony, and his own multitudinous observations of unquestionable veracity, makes this book convincing. It was under the impulse of J. Edgar Hoover, head of the F. B. I., who was himself shocked to the point of despair at what his office was revealing to his attention, that Mr. Cooper went out on the road, for months traveled the highways, investigated the cities, interrogated the police, himself lived with the swarming denizens of the underworld, and in these pages sets down what he learned, verified, and himself beheld. It is a picture that makes old Rome look like a Sunday school picnic.

One must read this book—a ghastly job!—to get any idea of the realities of crime, debauchery, degeneracy, and sheer corruption and horror which are not only existing but flourishing in this country today. No review can convey any conception of what Mr. Cooper sets forth with a reportorial vividness and verisimilitude which are overwhelming. Certain impressions stick. That the great majority of the practitioners of vice and crime, for example, are boys and girls—mere youngsters from fifteen to twenty-one or two years of age! That much of the vicious stuff is organized into rackets in the hands of the old-time bootleggers and criminals, and under the profitable protection of small-town, local police! That the shooting, murdering, gambling, drinking, harlotry, which formerly centered in the slums, hide-outs, and red-light districts of cities and towns, are now scattered broadcast, like a pestilence, over the whole face of the nation, thanks to automobiles, modern highways, bus lines, tourist camps, and the general movement of population! That the relief and W. P. A. policies of the government have become a dreadful source of demoralization! That crime is increasing out of all proportion to the accompanying facts of social life! That venereal disease is infecting the nation like the plague, and laying low a whole generation of reckless youth! That there is something like a complete breakdown these days of the moral control of church, school, and home! That the sins of the children are largely the sins of the parents who have neglected and indulged their offspring! That juvenile courts, parole systems, and other modern judicial devices are flat failures! That the standards of this age, if they may be called standards, stand utterly discredited, that conscience seems dead in vast hosts of our people, and that nothing perhaps is quite so much needed as a return to good, old-fashioned ideas of virtue! To which we would ourselves add the destruction of the liquor traffic, for, in every horror that Mr. Cooper lays bare before us, "booze" is the central and decisive factor!

This book will probably be plentifully denounced as sensational, even sentimental. We would place it, as the fearless testimony of an honest, hard-boiled, thoroughly objective reporter, among the required reading

of the hour. If we do not know the facts set forth in these pages, we are culpably ignorant. If we know, as we should know, and do nothing, then are we consigning our country and its civilization to the death which in every age has been "the wages of sin."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

Correspondence

Russia and Mendelism

Editor of UNITY:

I would like to ask you the authority for the statement made in UNITY of August 21, 1939 that Mendelian heredity has been barred from (the schools of?) Russia.

This statement has been made by no less than Dr. Calhoun of Yale Divinity School and constitutes a serious charge. If it is true, then no one can claim that truth is an object of concern any longer in Russia.

However, the Communists report that these statements that Mendelian heredity cannot be taught in Russia are false by and large. They refer one to the June 30, 1939 number of *The Bulletin of the Soviet Union*, Vol. 4, IB, No. 12, which summarizes all of the genetic research that has been going on in Russia since 1936, and in no sense, it is stated, has Mendelian heredity been banned as your editorial, for instance, implies.

I have read your publication for several months now and find it very enlightening. If you have authority for your statement, then I apologize for this letter; but I do believe that as liberals in religion we must investigate both sides of a question very thoroughly before we brand Stalin as analogous to the Pope and intimate that his form of suppressing the truth is no better than Hitler's.

HUGH WESTON.

Meadville Theological School,
Chicago, Illinois

[NOTE: UNITY's authority for its statement was a Moscow dispatch in the New York *Times* from its special correspondent, Mr. Harold Denny, a man long since proved trustworthy. The dispatch particularly pointed out that the banning of Mendelism was a reversal of all previous policy and a repudiation of much important scientific work done in Russia—which would seem to answer the appeal to the June 30, 1939 *Bulletin.*—*Editor.*]

How to Make a Communist

Editor of UNITY:

This Spring I had the good fortune to go to Europe, making both trips by third-class cabin. It was a most interesting experience. I went over on a small boat, the *Scythia*, of some 20,000 tons. I had wonderful accommodations, a fine stateroom in the Island under the Captain's Bridge on Deck A. A delightful covered deck for my chair! Aft we had two large decks, one covered, one uncovered, where we had ample room for walking and exercise.

The Lounge was small, but we had a writing room and a smoking room and bar combined. These rooms were quite all right though not at all elegant.

I came back third-class on the much vaunted *Queen Mary*, and had I been so inclined I would certainly have been a Communist by the time I landed, because of the unfair distribution of space.

Like those in the first and second-class cabins, we of the third paid an extra fare for speed and the privilege of a luxury ship, having been told that third-class on this boat was finer than second on most of their smaller and older liners. Steerage days are gone, remember, and three-fourths of the passengers were people of refinement, often culture, such as students, professors, teachers, etc.

The inside arrangements were all that could be desired. My cabin was adequate, clean, with good service. The Garden Lounge, writing room and smoking room also were adequate and well furnished.

But when it came to the vital need of exercise, fresh air and the privilege of seeing the ocean, the Cunard Company and I parted company. From my point of view, these three things everyone should be privileged to have at all times on an ocean voyage—even one of some four days.

The entire deck space was given to the first and second cabins and the little left over was given to the third. Yet remember that we paid *more* for the luxury of crossing on the *Queen Mary*, as did the other two cabins!

If it was foggy, damp, or rainy there was no possibility of even getting a breath of God's fresh air or seeing the ocean, which I happen to love at all times. Even when the skies were blue and the sun shone there was not one decent free bit of deck space for a real walk. In fact, it was impossible to get any exercise, for we had no gymnasium to replace lack of deck space.

One day was fair and I could very well have sat all day in my chair, but the wind blew hard and, linked with the speed of the boat, there was such a gale that few of us, if any, were able to cross the deck and go down the steps to where the chairs were located.

On the other hand, the first cabin is luxury, on luxury, on luxury *ad nauseam*. Lounges, smoking rooms, long corridor rooms, rooms for non-smokers, cocktail lounge, grill room, private dining rooms, swimming pool, Turkish baths, and gymnasium. Besides all this, there is so much deck space that were the cabins filled to capacity, the passengers could not begin to use it all. Yet one can cross in first cabin for some $225 minimum, not so much more expensive than on the ordinary large liners not known as luxury liners.

The second cabin is $50 more than the third—at least I could have transferred to it for that amount extra!

There they had delightful lounges, swimming pool, gymnasium, etc., large glassed-in deck and a large uncovered deck where chairs can be put, places for games and enough free space for ample walking and exercise in the open air.

Now I maintain that for the extra price which I paid, I got little extra but speed, and had the privilege of being denied the chance for decent exercise in the open—in fact, denied even a whiff of fresh air and a sight of the ocean unless every condition was just right.

The amount extra paid by the first and second cabin passengers was not so much greater, yet what they got for that was extra luxury in every category, luxury rooms, and deck space beyond the possibility of using it adequately.

Had I known all this in advance I would not have paid extra and gone on this liner, but one never knows until one really does it.

Nothing on earth would ever induce me to cross again on such a boat. It is, from my point of view, an insult to ordinary decency and an outrage to those who because of lack of means must go third or not at all.

Yes, the terrible unfairness in disposition of space almost made me a Communist.

A. MARION HOLMES.

Brookline, Massachusetts.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 18)

tions, access to raw materials, political and racial problems, international order and governments, disarmament and such other questions as may be deemed advisable.

It is obvious that if the work of such commissions is not to be futile, governments must agree to do all in their power to prevent disturbing incidents, and further show such good will as alone can make the work of the commissions effective.

We are fully aware of the fact that churches and religious and educational leaders are not experts in government and therefore we do not pretend to advise in detail on the ways and means of bringing about the success of such a huge and complicated undertaking. But deeply conscious of our responsibilities as Christians as well as citizens of our respective nations we claim that it is our right and duty to issue this appeal in loyalty to the Christ we serve. Therefore we invite all men of good will to join us in this effort and in particular we call upon our fellow Christians throughout the world to pray and work for a rebirth of faith, confidence, and love, without which it will be impossible to achieve justice, and without justice there can be no permanent peace.